

Remarks

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on November 13, 2002. Claims 1, 2, and 5 have been amended, support for the amendments being found, for example, at page 1, lines 24-32, and page 6, lines 1-29, of the present application. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-5 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

In section 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell, U.S. Patent No. 4,339,934, in view of Huzyak, U.S. Patent No. 4,478,062. This rejection is respectfully traversed, to the extent it is maintained in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

As noted in previous responses, claim 1 is directed to a method for rolling or winding a strip. Claim 1 recites steps of: (1) measuring a tension in a portion of the strip between rolls, winders, or control, guide or deflecting rollers with a measuring roller, and (2) contacting the strip with a partitioning device so as to absorb transverse stresses in the strip proximate the measuring roller due to asymmetric introduction of tension and distortions in the strip.

Claim 1 further recites that the strip has a wedge-shaped cross section. As noted, for example, at page 6, lines 1-29 of the present application, rolling of a strip with a wedge-shaped cross section presents unique problems in that, because of its wedge shape, the strip "runs out of the true," or is physically displaced perpendicular to the transport direction. Therefore, because of this undesirable displacement, the measuring roller is unable to provide reliable measurement values.

By contacting the strip with a partitioning device as recited by claim 1, transverse stresses in the strip, caused as least in part by the wedge-shaped cross section of the strip, are absorbed so that the measuring roller can provide more accurate measurement values.

In contrast, Mitchell is directed to a metal strip rolling mill in which the strip includes a slightly greater gauge (i.e. thickness) in the center than along the sides of the strip. See, e.g., column 1, lines 22-27, and column 2, lines 14-19 of Mitchell. Mitchell does not suggest using a strip with a wedge-shaped cross section, as recited by claim 1. A strip configured as recited in Mitchell, i.e. with a thicker center than sides, does not exhibit the same issues as a strip with a wedge-shaped cross section, in that the strip of Mitchell does not generate forces in the transverse direction.

Therefore, assuming for the sake of argument only that the roll 30 of Mitchell functions in a manner similar to the partitioning device recited in claim 1, Mitchell fails to suggest using a strip with a wedge-shaped cross section and therefore fails to suggest that the metal strip rolling mill in Mitchell would be configured to absorb the transverse stresses presented by the wedge-shaped cross section of the strip recited by claim 1.

Huzyak is cited solely for a shape sensing roll 18, and does not suggest use of a strip with a wedge-shaped cross section, as recited by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, neither Mitchell nor Huzyak, along or in combination, render claim 1 obvious under section 103(a). Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 2 is directed to a device for rolling or winding a strip of wedge-shaped cross section and recites a partitioning device adapted to absorb transverse stresses in the strip. Further, claim 5 recites a method for rolling or winding a strip of wedge-shaped cross section and recites contacting the strip with a partitioning device so as to absorb transverse stresses in the strip. Therefore, claims 2 and 5, as well as claims 3 and 4 that depend therefrom, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as recited above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, claims 1-5 are now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration in the form of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

*Rob Kalinsky
612-336-4771*

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: April 14, 2003



By: *[Signature]*
Name: John J. Gresens
Reg. No. 33,112
JJG/RAK:pll